



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. VII.—1. *The American Crisis considered.* By CHARLES LEMPRIERE, D. C. L., of the Inner Temple, late Fellow of St. John's College, in the University of Oxford. London. 1861.

2. *The American Union.* By JAMES SPENCE. London. 1861.

3. *Les Etats Unis en 1861. Un Grand Peuple qui se relève.* Par le COMTE AGENOR DE GASPARIN. Paris: Michel Lévy Frères. 1861.

WE propose to ourselves the somewhat ungracious task of examining the contrast, which all must have noted, between the French and the English method in the discussion of the present troubles in the United States. In both countries, the interest in the American question has been absorbing. This interest is especially remarkable in France, where we have seen torpid journals, with the life half crushed out of them by the long-continued pressure of imperial supervision, plunging day after day into all the complicated political and social questions to which it gives rise, and treating them, not always with accuracy, it is true, but with a life and vigor which seem to show how much they rejoice in an opportunity of talking politics with freedom, even though it be but foreign politics;—while in England the leading columns of the innumerable periodicals, high and low, Whig and Tory, daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly, are filled with the speculations and prophecies of interested journalists, now calm and authoritative, now heated and violent, and once in a while earnest and friendly; and, as if this were not enough, at the rate of about two each month, more ambitious essays are published, in the shape of octavo volumes, claiming each to exhaust the subject up to the date of its issue.

We have placed at the head of this article the titles of three books, two English, and one French, which we think may fairly stand as exponents of the prevailing sentiment in the two countries; and if we give a brief sketch of their contents, and indicate in some degree the views which their authors seem inclined to adopt on this subject, we shall perhaps be doing some service to those who believe in the unanimity of European opinion on American affairs.

Of the two English books we may say that, had they been published anonymously, we should have confidently pronounced them to be the work of men with whose views and manner of expressing them we all had had occasion to be more than sufficiently familiar. Mr. Lempriere's book we should have assigned to the Hon. Mr. Wigfall, late Senator from the Commonwealth of Texas,—or to the Hon. Mr. Keitt, late Representative from the sovereign State of South Carolina,—so much has it the air of a compilation from the speeches of those types of a class of statesmen who once ruled the nation, and have now departed from its councils, we trust forever. Mr. Spence's book we should have accredited to Mr. J. D. B. De Bow, whose Review it emulates in its aversion to figures,—or perhaps, in a more generous mood, to Mr. Jefferson Davis himself, who need hardly be ashamed of its ingenuity in making white appear black, and black white. But as the great seats of English learning have not yet gone so far in their appreciation of our Southern brethren as to bestow fellowships upon them, and furthermore, as one of the books bears on its title-page a name which of late has become somewhat noted in the commercial circles of so great a port as Liverpool, we are forced reluctantly to deprive the new Confederacy of the credit of a literary beginning so distinguished, and to add these to the number, already large, of the extraordinary contributions to political knowledge with which English writers have favored us within the short period of our domestic troubles.

To have obtained the fellowship and the degree which are announced on the title-page copied above, Mr. Lempriere must necessarily be a man of some education and of some culture. It is in this view alone that we can feel ourselves justified even in the shortest notice of a book, of which, in this view, the ignorance and vulgarity are absolutely astonishing. The brief extracts we shall permit ourselves will illustrate these qualities sufficiently without the need of any comments upon them. On page vi. of the Introduction he speaks of "the coercion and abolition which has been the policy of the leading portion of the Northern statesmen for the last twenty years." On page 2 he finds "a right of resist-

ance" to the authority of a newly elected administration, "in the legislative action of the several States, or of the whole combined, in Senate and Congress." "Nor is it any answer to say that the President, being duly elected according to law, became *ipso facto* governor of the country. *He did not*, until he was accepted by the legislatures both of the separate States and of the whole combined, which we know has never been the case." On page 96 he says: "The North, by a systematic and violent attack on the property, and even lives, of their fellow-citizens, forced them into an attitude of defence. The armed and fierce action was entirely on the part of the North. *They* appeal to arms, and on them is the heavy onus." We give these passages as examples of the author's ignorance, because it is less unpleasant than to assume them to have been deliberately published with a knowledge of their falsity,— which is the only alternative. As an example of the other quality which we specified, we give this passage from the chapter in which the author reviews the Letter of Mr. Motley to the London Times: "Englishmen know that the oft-repeated assertion that 'the Republican party, in its desire to set bounds to the extension of slavery, had no design, secret or avowed, against slavery in the States,' is a palpable, patent, and wicked lie,— and 'the noble and generous desire of all parties in the free States to vindicate the sullied honor of their flag' is mere bunkum to get him the loaves and fishes, which we see Mr. Motley has posted off to Washington to secure."

These extracts, taken at random, are quite sufficient to show the character of the book which the "late Fellow of St. John's College" has produced, and any further notice of it is as unnecessary as it is distasteful.

Mr. Spence's book is of quite another character, and we shall notice it more at length. The author is a Liverpool merchant of distinction,— a loyal subject of King Cotton,— and was chairman of the excited meeting held by his fellow-subjects in the Cotton-sales room, in response to the placards of the Secessionist emissaries, on the day of the arrival in England of the news of the seizure of Mason and Slidell on board the Trent. The sound and fury of that meeting our readers will no doubt remember, and also the manner in which the

good sense of some of its speakers stepped in to modify the absurdity of its resolutions. The report of the meeting which was sent to the London Times concluded with this quiet remark: "At the conclusion of the meeting, which was at four o'clock, a number of the older merchants on Change expressed their conviction that the meeting and its proceedings had been premature." The chairman's book had been given to the press some three weeks previously, judging from the date of its Preface, and he must have sorely regretted his inability to introduce into that publication the additional element of popularity which it would have gained by the discussion of so interesting a topic as the seizure of the rebel emissaries, and the "affront to the British flag." We have said that Mr. Spence's book is of quite a different character from that of Mr. Lempriere. It is different, however, not in its conclusions, but in its manner of treating the subject, and in its temper. It is calm throughout, and respectably well written, with a vein of philosophy running through its discussions, and a continued profession of the most friendly sentiments, which, even in their expression, seem to attach rather to the country, geographically considered, than to the inhabitants. "What desire has any one here, except to see that great country the home of a really great people? Few feelings are deeper in the human breast than love of kindred." And again: "Personal considerations and valued friendships incline me without exception to the Northern side." These he has so far successfully resisted as to be able to say, at the beginning of the Preface, what is fully justified by every chapter which follows: "Lest the neutral title of the present work should beguile the reader to assume that neutrality of opinion will pervade it, I warn him at once, on the threshold, that he will soon encounter a current of reasoning strongly adverse to the present doctrine and action of the Northern party." After a Preface of which this is the key-note, the book opens with a chapter on the political institutions of the United States, of which the aim is to prove these institutions defective in theory and destructive in practice,—unphilosophic in themselves, and wholly unsuited to the needs of so large and populous a country. Its reasoning is in many instances ingenious, and its quotation of

American authorities plausible and skilful ; but the essay is a clear case of special pleading throughout, and the argument, as a whole, entirely fallacious. He assumes, for instance, that the population of the United States is not *homogeneous* ; each State having marked peculiarities of custom and interest, and a patriotism more or less limited to its own borders ; — and then, after enumerating the various instances of the formation of confederacies in history, he says : “ Certainly, in every other instance on record, federal republicanism, where the component states have had the dimensions of powers and not of provinces, has proved a signal failure.” But this is precisely what was not the case with the parties to the Constitution of 1789. Not one of the thirteen Colonies had ever even claimed the dignity of a “ power,” or had possessed for a day any other nationality than that represented by the government at London or the Continental Congress.\* Through all the vicissitudes of party violence since that time, the instances in which State pride has been invoked in opposition to national patriotism have been so few and so inconspicuous, in the face of the steady adherence to the federal government and respect for its laws, that the argument would fall to the ground at once, had it not the apparent countenance of the present sharply-defined division. This circumstance, however, fails to give it any real weight, because the division follows so closely the line of demarcation between slavery and freedom, and because when that line disappears, and the anomalous interest which created the rebellion shall have happily ceased to exist, there will remain absolutely nothing to prevent the thirty-four States from becoming as completely “ homogeneous” as the eighteen free States are to-day. All will admit that, with the possible exception of France, there is not a nation in Europe which possesses the desirable quality implied by that extremely awkward word in as great a degree as the Northern United States. Yet if difference of commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests, — if diversity in laws regulating internal affairs, — if the strongest contrasts in

---

\* See the clear statement of this fact in the inaugural address of President Lincoln.

tastes, habits, and modes of life,—if the widest variation in climate and geographical position among a people stretching from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains, ay, and thence to the Pacific,—could alienate one portion of such a people from another portion, or distract or divide the allegiance which all should bear to the central government, should we have seen, almost within the limits of a single generation, the rapid and continual advance of this people westward, and the formation of State after State from the wilderness of yesterday, each with its own conscious future bright with the promise of strength and vigor, and all without a whisper in one of them of any other ambition but to be soonest admitted a loyal member of the great family of States, and farthest to advance the general welfare and glory? Does any intelligent man, honest at the same time, believe that anything has prevented a similar exhibition of good faith and honorable ambition in the States which have been admitted south of that ill-omened line, but the adoption of a domestic theory and policy which has no moral right to exist at all, and with which nothing honest or worthy ever can be or ought to be “homogeneous”? It is a fair question, if any institutions other than the freest and most enlightened could have existed for seventy years under such a burden. Mr. Mill, in his admirable book on “Representative Government,” says: “In America, all the conditions for the maintenance of union exist at the highest point, with the sole drawback of difference of institutions on the single but most important article of slavery.” He might have added, that, if the North had believed slavery to be a permanent and unalterable fact in the Southern States, there would have been but one answer to any demand of the South for a separation, and that would have been, “Go, in Heaven’s name, and relieve *us* at least of the weight you choose to carry.” It was because the recognition of slavery as a transient evil was universal, and the difference of opinion was on the single question how to deal with it in such a manner as to escape with the greatest certainty the perils which must follow premature or unwise legislation, that the North has borne and forborne even to the end, of which we trust we already see the beginning; and if Mr. Spence were but half

as candid and friendly as he professes to be, he would see and acknowledge that the examples of the old federations of history—which have been formed for purposes of offensive or defensive warfare, out of states which had possessed separate nationalities for ages, and have fallen asunder when the special ends for which they united had been more or less completely answered—have no just parallel in the formation, history, and growth of the United States.

Mr. Spence tells some mournful truths in regard to our national defects of character and manners, of which we are only too conscious, and whose existence we must frankly admit. We have never assumed, except perhaps in the inflated utterances of our Fourth of July celebrations, that the great machinery has worked perfectly as yet, without noise and occasional jar among its many and complicated members. The *régime* which still excludes from the highest places the worthiest men; the lack of dignity and elevation in the proceedings of Congress; the savage and sordid avarice which governs the system of “rotation in office”; the prevalence of the shameless and detestable business of “lobbying,”—all these abuses, and more as bad, still continue to mortify our just pride, and to make us painfully aware that much wisdom and labor are yet to be given to the work of perfecting our republican system. But it is by no means certain that all or most of these abuses are peculiar to that system. Most of them, we think, may be recognized, under varying conditions, not always equally conspicuous, in all forms of government, from democracy to despotism. But it is the fortune of a republic, whether for good or ill we need not say, that its defects are visible and conspicuous; while under a despotism the deadliest influences may be at work at the heart of the state without once ruffling the placid and glittering exterior of the court. Very nearly all the abuses which Mr. Spence is so fond of exhibiting were in full flower when De Tocqueville was in the country, and his intelligent mind did not fail to observe and to deplore their existence; yet they did not prevent his writing these words to a friend in France, which do not sound much like the words of one who feared for the stability of the fabric he had come to examine: “Christianity rests

here upon a firmer basis than in any other country that I know, and I have no doubt that the religious element influences the political one. It induces morality and regularity ; it restrains the eccentricities of the spirit of innovation ; above all, it is almost fatal to the mental condition so common with us, in which men leap over every obstacle, *per fas et nefas*, to gain their point.”\* After all, perhaps the best claim we can make for our institutions is that they provide for their own amendment whenever the people, who alone are directly affected by them, shall be satisfied of the need.

The first chapter closes with an emphatic condemnation of the rule by which the Cabinet ministers have no place or voice in Congress ; and Mr. Spence’s remarks on this topic seem to us so just, that we venture to quote them at length, and to say further that the subject is one which might at a proper time be advantageously considered by the government and people.

“ We have seen that, under the system in force, ability is excluded from the highest office in the state ; there is another cause which very largely excludes it from the legislative chambers. The ministers are not permitted to take part in the proceedings of Congress. To judge of the effects of this, we have only to imagine the result of excluding the whole of the ministry from the House of Commons. The men who of all others have access to the sources of information, who are thoroughly conversant with details, and who possess the requisite experience and ability to guide the debates of the assembly,—these men are not to come within its walls. And this deprivation of ability is a small evil compared with others that result. Who can put a question to a minister who is never there to be questioned ? There is a complete absence of that sharp and effective responsibility to the people through their representatives which we should hardly like to exchange for a system of secret management of the House by parties who can never be seen face to face. Thus no minister can introduce and explain his own measure, he must do so second-hand. He cannot be made to avow his own opinions,—no responsibility can be fixed upon him. He must work the business of the government through private arrangement with members of the House, and use patronage to supply the place of ability or knowledge. We have some impatience of the

\* Letter to Count L. de Kergorlay, dated Caldwell, N. Y., June 20, 1831. *Vide* Memoir and Remains, Vol. I.

very idea of what is called ‘back-stairs influence,’ and what shall we say to a system in which the whole business of the government is conducted on the back-stairs principle, and where, indeed, there can be no other?” — p. 42.

Here is some exaggeration, no doubt, but the objection has force, and the views are those of every British writer who has had occasion to introduce the topic. Hallam, in his “Constitutional History,” speaking of the threatened exclusion of the ministers from the House of Commons, in 1693, says: “Such a separation and want of intelligence between the crown and Parliament must have destroyed the one and weakened the other. It is one of the greatest safeguards of our liberty, that eloquent and ambitious men, such as aspire to guide the councils of the crown, are from habit and use so connected with the Houses of Parliament, and derive from them so much of their renown and influence, that they lie under no temptation, nor could without insanity be persuaded, to diminish the authority and privileges of that assembly.” The present is no time for attempting reforms in the Constitution or customs of the House of Representatives; but we hope the day is not far distant when the settlement of the mighty issues which now engage all the wisdom and all the strength of the nation shall leave its wisest minds at liberty to take such topics into consideration.

In the chapter which follows, professing to treat of the effects of the institutions of the country on the national character, our author records a great variety of hasty judgments, made up at a distance of three thousand miles from the scene of action, chiefly from false or exaggerated newspaper accounts, and not in any case, so far as we can guess, from personal study or from authentic information, all agreeing in the main point, *quod erat demonstrandum*, that very little, if anything, is left in the United States, either of institutions or people, that is worth preserving. Here are a few examples of these decisions:— “It is the established practice of the country, in the face of ample records of the facts, wilfully to pervert its own history, in order to satisfy this desire for exaggeration. It is not easy to imagine a more deplorable spectacle than a people thus employed in self-deception, receiving their knowledge and forming

their opinions on the exaggerations of declaimers, each striving to outvie his predecessors." (p. 50.) The authority for this generalization is an account of a Fourth of July Oration which Miss Martineau once heard and described. Again: "The Union has now a Paris. Whoever has studied the progress of the momentous events now occurring will have seen that the Washington government simply follows the impulse of the people; . . . . but the people of the North, in their turn, implicitly follow the lead of New York. Whatever decision is formed there flies over the land by telegraph, and is adopted before the day is out." (p. 57.) The collision between the civil and military authorities in the Merryman case, the seizure by the government of the telegraphic records, the confiscation of rebel property, and certain unfortunate acts of violence in New York and elsewhere during the excited days of April, are of course pressed into service, as conclusive evidence that, "whatever may have been the love of liberty in other days, it has become a thing of the past." (p. 60.) The assault on Mr. Sumner in the Senate, (the fact of the assailant being a Representative from South Carolina is forgotten,) and the murder of the District Attorney at Washington by a New York Representative, are cited as natural results of the political system; and while the former is described as having occurred "in open session," the latter is said to have been rewarded by "the adoption of the murderer as an object of public sympathy and admiration," and his elevation to the rank of Brigadier-General in the Northern army. These we cite as instances of the way in which Mr. Spence, by a skilful study of the "art of putting things," is enabled to give the impression he wishes to convey without often resorting to direct falsehood.

His inquiry into the causes of disruption is ingenious and plausible, and one which might have been made and promulgated by Jefferson Davis as a public document, without any imputation of inconsistency. Entirely in the interest of the South, entirely unjust to the character and motives of the North, which so slowly and timidly advanced to the election of Mr. Lincoln, it makes an assumption of fairness and candor which is ill sustained by the entire absence of any allusion to the condition of the rebellious States, which has made it for years past

a more dangerous thing for a Northern man with Northern principles to travel freely in South Carolina or Alabama than in Madagascar,—ill sustained by the ready forgiveness of such crimes as blacken the records of the Buchanan Cabinet, by the elaborate argument for the inferiority of the negro race, by his abuse of the Abolitionists, by his assertion that “the present contest is not (on the part of the South) for the furtherance of slavery,” and his arraignment of the North (just enough by itself) for the protection and favor it has bestowed upon that institution, and by his claim for the “superior intellectual culture of the South.” The anti-slavery feeling of the North is accounted for in the following easy manner. “The Democrat supports slavery,—the object of the Republican is to defeat the Democrat,—therefore he must needs object to slavery as a party matter.” A precedent for the present rebellion and its proper treatment is found in the Nullification Act of South Carolina in 1832, on which occasion he declares that “the State was right so far as justice was concerned,” and that “the fact is admitted by the ablest Northern writers of the present day,” and was so far admitted by Jackson and the Congress, that a conciliatory policy was adopted toward the rebellious State, and “a measure for the removal of the grievance” was introduced by Mr. Clay, and “pushed through with unprecedented rapidity, by an evasion of the rules.” Such are the tone and manner of this inquiry, which closes with the declaration (p. 246), that “secession is a just and clear constitutional right of the States, and no violation of any enactment of the federal compact.”

Following this is a long consideration of the conditions of the struggle for the preservation of the Union, in which the blunders and misstatements are so thick-set that we can only indicate a few of the most flagrant. The advantages of the conflict are found to be almost wholly with the South,—the numerical and financial superiority of the North being counted rather unfavorable than otherwise. The industrial conditions in the South are greatly in its favor;—the rebels are rich in internal resources, and if they were poor, all the better; “history affords ample evidence that the absence of wealth has proved no barrier to the defence of an invaded country.”

(p. 255.) Again, the discipline of the troops is much more easily maintained in the Southern than in the Northern armies. "The Northerner will obey with impatience under feelings of restraint that seek escape,—his position is repugnant to all his former theories,—impatient of control as a child, it is impossible he can be docile under the bonds of discipline. . . . . The Southerner, on the other hand, will accept his position, whether to command or to obey, as the proper order of things."

(p. 261.) The blockade is unconstitutional as well as foolish. England blockaded France twenty years, and in the midst of it all France achieved her greatest triumphs. It may be injurious to the South, "but to the North disastrous in the end," — by stimulating privateering, which may become an intolerable nuisance to Northern trade,— by paralyzing the Northern manufactures, and leading in the end to the interference of foreign powers. (p. 273.) The reduction of Charleston is wellnigh impossible, and useless if accomplished. The Mississippi expedition is ludicrous, because troops cannot be sent in the river boats, and to construct a flotilla which could face artillery, and at the same time convey the requisite number of troops, would be the work of years. He pronounces the emancipation of the slaves "an impotent act of vengeance," says that the proclamation of Fremont "copies the ferocity of a Mexican Creole," and quotes with admiration the defiant speech of Mr. Iverson of Georgia in the Senate, last winter. He scoffs at the idea of any natural friendship between England and the Northern States, gives a rancorous sketch of the numerous offences committed by us against the dignity and interest of Great Britain, and concludes finally that "the attempt to subdue the Southern country and people is a lamentable delusion, attempted not as the decision of calm judgment, but the rash result of that unreasoning excitement to which the people of the North are now subject," and that his "clear conviction" is "that nothing is more essential to the real welfare of the American people than a termination of the American Union."

After spending so much time in this somewhat tedious review of the book of Mr. Spence, it will be unnecessary to make any extended remarks upon its merits. This is rendered all the more needless by the transparent character and

aim of the book, which is a singularly characteristic illustration of the curiously divided duty which the manufacturing and commercial Englishman sees in this strange crisis. His tastes, his feelings, his natural sympathies, all incline him decisively to the Northern side—that is to say, to the national side—of the question; but his manufacturing and commercial *instincts* are stronger than tastes, or feelings, or sympathies, and determine irresistibly the direction of his support. So, while declaiming with fine emphasis against slavery, he opens wide arms of welcome to the envoys of the Confederacy which declares slavery to be its corner-stone. So, while complaining bitterly of the long series of insults and injuries which England has borne at the hands of America within a generation, he carefully forgets that the men who, if any, instigated those indignities are now the traitors, of whose cause he is willing to become the advocate and patron. And as the typical Englishman is unmistakably manufacturing and commercial, it follows that the national bent, in a case like the present, is precisely that which finds just and clear expression in the book before us. We do not wish to deny or to forget that there have been books published in England within the past year which take precisely the opposite ground, and recognize with perfect candor and freedom the magnitude of the issue, and the justice of the Northern cause. But no man can believe, in the face of all that has been written and spoken in England since the commencement of our troubles, that such books represent the people of Great Britain; and he must have studied human nature to little purpose who, in reading the books and the journals which do represent it, feels any lasting wonder at the warmth of their sympathy with the rebellious South, or at the misrepresentations and calumnies in which they indulge toward the loyal North.

Let us now turn, and we confess to an infinite relief in doing so, to a brief analysis of the work of M. de Gasparin, of which a short notice was contained in a former number of this Review, but which, from the character of its author, as well as from its own merits, deserves a more emphatic judgment than we were able at that time to give it. Its author has never travelled in America, and is known here chiefly by

his book on Slavery and the Slave-trade,\* a serious and earnest work devoted to the advocacy of emancipation in the French West Indies, according to a plan proposed and elaborated with much thought by the author, and which bore on its title-page this motto from the Italian theatre, of which the application was at once felicitous and pungent : —

“Ricardo. — Io nol posso —  
Giorgio. — Tu non vuoi.”

M. de Gasparin, after the publication of this work, labored diligently with pen and voice for the accomplishment of this worthy end, until he had the happiness of seeing his labors meet with substantial success. Since the re-establishment of the Empire, he has lived, for the most part, in a dignified retirement, — of which Miss Bremer, in her last-published book, gives us a pleasant glimpse, — interested in whatever social or political movement seems to promise any real advance in the halting and irregular march of the race toward civilization.

The present book is not quite free from the inevitable errors and misapprehensions of an author who writes of a country he has never seen, and of a people he has never studied face to face. Also, in the quick march of events since the book was published, many of its speculations have quite lost their value, except as records of the extraordinary excitement and bewilderment of the public mind which made them possible ; and it is a noticeable fact, that this book, of which the Preface is dated “Orange, March 19, 1861,” already seems more like a production of the past than did the work of De Tocqueville two years ago. But the errors we can overlook, and the speculations, whether verified or disproved by subsequent events, never formed the chief value of the book, which seems rather to consist in its generous enthusiasm for a noble cause ; in its singular freedom from any tinge of political bigotry ; in its joyful and almost triumphant perception of the greatness of the movement by which this people seek to throw off an ignoble burden of subserviency, and to establish on a firmer foundation than ever before the great principle of self-government and the supremacy of constitutional law ; and in its recognition

---

\* *Esclavage et Traite.* Paris. 1838.

of the fact that the struggle and agony of the conflict, far from being taken as evidence of approaching dissolution, should be regarded as evidence of new life, and a promise of renewed strength and health. “On vient de sauver les Etats Unis!” he cries, with ardor,—I repeat it with profound and deliberate conviction,—“the United States have been saved.” And here is the point upon which the author takes issue with those in his own country, and elsewhere in Europe, who read the signs of the times as indicating the speedy ruin of the republic whose growth and development had for three generations not ceased to astonish and puzzle them. The croakers are always the most numerous body whenever a government or an individual is overtaken by disaster, and never hesitate to predict with confidence the speedy end of all things. But in this case our author assures these prophets of ill, with a confidence equal to their own, that they are to be disappointed,—that the patient is young and vigorous, that the greatest danger is past, and the future full of hope. Let us here give his own words.

“The common opinion is that the progress of the United States ceased with the election of Mr. Lincoln, and that since that period they have only declined. It is not difficult, and it is very necessary, to prove this opinion to be entirely false. Before the recent victory of the opponents of slavery, the American Union, spite of its material progress and its apparent prosperity, was suffering from a dreadful disease, which was very near proving fatal;—now an operation has been performed, the pain has increased, and the gravity of the situation reveals itself for the first time, perhaps, to careless eyes. Shall we say that the situation was not grave until it seemed so? and must we deplore that violent crisis through which alone a cure was possible? *I* do not deplore,—I admire! I recognize in this vigorous reaction against the disease the moral health of a people accustomed to the laborious struggles of liberty. Such an uprising of a people is one of the most rare and marvellous spectacles to be found in the annals of the race. Commonly, nations which have begun to waver lean constantly more and more to their fall. It is a rare vitality indeed which enables one to recover itself and stand erect after the decline has once begun. . . . . Till lately the United States were marching straight to their ruin. Till lately we had enough to lament in thinking of them,—we could count the steps which they had yet to take, to complete the alliance of their destiny with that of an accursed institution which deserves only to per-

ish,—of an institution which corrupts and destroys all that it touches. To-day a new prospect is opened to them ;—there must be struggle, labor, suffering ; the crime of a century is not to be atoned for in a day ; the path of national justice once lost is not to be regained without effort ; a nation cannot, more than a man, break away without sacrifice from guilty traditions and the complicities of ages, but it is nevertheless true that the hour of effort and of sacrifice, painful as it may be, is yet the hour of deliverance. The election of Mr. Lincoln will be one of the great points of American history,—it closes the past, but it opens the future. With it has commenced, if only the same spirit be maintained, —if excessive concessions shall not succeed in undoing what has been done,—a new order of things, at once more pure and more great than that which has come to an end.”—pp. 3—6.

This is very noble. Our enemies, foreign and domestic, would say it is too enthusiastic to be philosophical, and would extend their objection to the whole of the book, which is pervaded throughout by the same spirit. But we shall doubtless be excused if we prefer the honest enthusiasm of friendship to the calmness which proceeds from the calculations of a selfish ambition, and of which we have seen so admirable examples in the treatises with which the London Times has favored us for some months past, as well as in some of the oldest and most respectable of the quarterlies of Great Britain. As our friendly author gracefully says,—“The side which is beautiful is often the side which is true ; if the eyes of Love are bandaged, I perceive a triple bandage over the eyes of Hate. Charity has its privileges, and I do not think myself less favorably placed than another for judging the United States because they inspire me with a thoughtful sympathy, or because, having mourned over their faults and trembled at their perils, I have joyfully hailed the noble and manly policy of which the election of Mr. Lincoln was the symptom.”

That the enthusiasm of M. de Gasparin is not the blind partiality of a partisan, and that his eyes are as sharp to see the faults as the virtues of the American people, take the following passage as proof : —

“I do not admire vulgarity, and I do not admit that it is the necessary companion of energy ; the tone of the public journals, and that of the debates in Congress, are often such as to excite a just reprobation.

There is also in the United States a tendency to *level downward* (*un nivelingement par le bas*), a jealousy of acquired superiority, and especially of hereditary distinctions, which proceeds from the worst feelings of the heart. What is still more serious, the more kindly and tender side of our nature, that which shines in the pages of the Gospel, is too seldom seen among this people, with whom, nevertheless, that Gospel is held in reverence, but in whom the labors incident to so enormous a growth have developed the active virtues at the expense of the more amiable. The Americans are cold (*sees*), even when they are good, benevolent, and religious." — p. 79.

The author makes no secret of his detestation of American slavery, and of those men in the North who have been its advocates and supporters. Some of these still remain in the sheltering obscurity and tolerance of our Northern cities, and by such the book is doubtless set down as the work of a "fanatic" and a "man of one idea." Nothing could be farther from the truth. Slavery he sees and declares to have threatened for more than one generation the ruin of the nation. In the defeat of slavery at the last election he recognizes the cause, and the only cause, of the rebellion, and in the uprising of the loyal North against the rebellion he reads the approaching doom of that ancient enemy of civilization, and the beginning of the reign of real freedom. It is the old cry of the Marshal of France, "Le roi est mort, — vive le Roi!" This, it is true, is the theme and burden of the whole melody, and with it is mingled so much of cordial good-will and of congratulation toward the people to whom he gives the credit of so great a movement, that it is hard to see how any American whose loyalty is more than a pretence can read this book without some emotions of gratitude to a friend who sends us such words of lofty cheer in a time of need.

As we have said, a considerable portion of the work is given to the direct consideration of slavery in its character of chief conspirator, and of the questions which must arise either from its failure or its success in achieving its desired independence. But throughout this discussion, though the tone is earnest and zealous to a remarkable degree, there is yet no trace of fanaticism or of bitterness. He is always ready to acknowledge the natural influence of birth and education upon the

opinions of those in the South who labor for the support and extension of their favorite system, and to confess the probability that the best of those whose wrath is excited by their misdeeds might, with similar precedents, have been similarly guilty. "Severity is almost always a fault of memory. We blame others without pity only when we begin by forgetting our own history. We Frenchmen, who have with such difficulty freed our own slaves,— we who have tried to repeal in part, by our colonial regulations, the liberty once granted to the blacks,— who have allowed the recruiting by purchase on the coast of Africa,— nay, who once organized an expedition charged with the duty of re-establishing slavery and the slave-trade in San Domingo,— we whose conscience is burdened with these misdeeds, are bound to use all possible consideration toward the States of the South." (p. 111.) A single extract like this is surely sufficient to remove any suspicion of fanaticism,— a reproach which has in this country been so often and persistently misapplied as to have become almost synonymous with steadfastness and honest self-devotion,— and the same spirit of Christian tolerance and forgiveness is to be noticed throughout the whole work.

We have dwelt so long on the tone and temper of this book, that we have left ourselves space only for the briefest abstract of its plan. The first six chapters are taken up with the development and proof of the proposition laid down in the Preface, and which we have quoted above. The succession of reasoning is clearly enough indicated to us who know the sad history by heart, by the titles of the chapters:— I. American Slavery; II. Whither the United States were going before the Election of Mr. Lincoln; III. What that Election signified; IV. What must be thought of the United States; V. The Churches and Slavery; VI. The Gospel and Slavery. Of these six chapters the conclusion is briefly this,— that the position which the North took in the election of 1860, and took just in time, was delayed by many causes, chief among which were the apathy of the great religious bodies on the subject of slavery, and the direct interest which the commercial cities felt in its continuance, and that it was in spite of the opposition of these two great forces, theology and commerce, that

the people of the North, seeing the danger, resolved to avert it if yet there were time. They made the effort, and "the nation was saved." All this seems very trite, no doubt, to one who has been steeped for years in the bitterness and intensity of these discussions ; but let us not forget that, up to this time, even the cultivated classes of Europe have had but the dimmest possible ideas on the subject of American politics, and that, if we care for their opinion, it is important that they should be enlightened as to the facts. It is this service that M. de Gasparin has performed for us, with a clearness and point which most American writers would have found it hard to excel.

Having in the first half of the book given this succinct historical review, he devotes the remainder to the consideration of the actual crisis and its probable consequences. Here let it be remembered that the book was published at a time when only six of the eleven rebellious States had declared their treason, and before the attack on Fort Sumter had commenced the actual conflict ; so that, with the most remarkable precision in the statement of facts up to the time of writing, the author had slight grounds for judgment as to the probable issue of the troubles which were then but just beginning. This he frankly confesses, disclaiming at the outset any pretensions to the gift of prophecy. He nevertheless attacks the future courageously, and after a rapid survey of the condition of affairs at the time of the inauguration, including a scorching review of the conduct of Mr. Buchanan and his Cabinet of traitors during the four months previous to that event, and expressing the utter astonishment with which all foreign eyes beheld the mad race of the South in their road to ruin, he makes a very clear and succinct statement of the argument for the right of secession, exposing its utter fallacy, and imagining the condition of a confederacy of states which should start with a pronounced avowal of this right, and where each state would always be able to hold over the others the threat of separation in case of a refusal to come to its terms. Their Congress, he says, would be like those old horse-back Diets of Poland, where a single contrary vote brought everything to a dead-lock, so that there was no alternative but to finish the voting by sabre-strokes. He figures the great slave empire which rises in the

heated imaginations of the Southern leaders, “ stretching from the Delaware to the Uruguay,— a colossal negro-jail, continually supplying itself by a slave-trade not less colossal,— the barracoons filled once more on the coast of Africa, the hunting of fugitives organized on a scale hitherto unknown,— squadrons of slave-ships transporting their wretched cargoes under the Southern flag, proudly spread to the breeze ;— such is the project in its majestic unity ; such the dream which the extreme South once hoped to realize through its union with the North, and which it now hopes to realize through a separation.” (p. 189.)

Our author proceeds to show the manner in which the attempt at carrying out this scheme would prove ultimately fatal to its originators,— assuming that some such policy must be adopted whenever the present programme, which is from the necessity of the case merely temporary, should be rendered useless. By the revival of the foreign slave-trade the domestic and internal traffic between State and State would nearly cease, while at the same time the price of slaves must fall, causing heavy loss to planters throughout the confederacy. Hence would surely arise a radical division of interest, and consequent dissensions. A new South and a new North would be formed ;— “ they believe themselves united,— they proclaim themselves united, up to the inevitable moment when they discover that they have neither the same object nor the same spirit : nothing divides like a bad cause which turns out badly.” Next, the filibustering by which the territorial extension must be effected, if at all, would provoke the direct interference of foreign powers, predisposed to interference by natural disgust at the creation of a nation with such a programme. The extreme poverty of the South, the impossibility of sustaining any practicable system of revenue, the total absence of immigration, are reckoned as certain causes of decline and of dissension. Finally, the influence, direct and indirect, of the Northern States, with their free institutions, coupled with the varying interests of the various tiers of slave States,— these producing, those consuming,— would in a few years insure the return of the border States to the old Union, and the consequent loss of

the most compact and productive part of the population. “Unhappy country, which a blind passion, and still more an overweening pride, has plunged into the gulf of crime and misery! Poor excommunicated nation,—its principles accursed, its flag suspected, its contact shunned, its constantly recurring humiliations hardly compensated by some scanty profits,—the heart bleeds at the clear, certain, inevitable future that awaits such a number of men, who are, it should seem, not so much guilty as demented. With nothing in common with the rest of the world, with a police system along their frontier to resist the fatal introduction of liberal ideas, what portion of the world can have with them either political or moral or religious sympathy?” (p. 246.)

This picture of the wretched coil in which the rebel States have wound themselves is graphic, and in the main undoubtedly true, though the author lays, very naturally, more stress on the weight and power of foreign opinion than has been justified by the subsequent events. The “maledictions of the universe” have not yet descended on the Southern cause, and will not descend until that cause becomes hopeless. The Southern “Cabinet” has not yet begun to tremble at the hostility, though they may have been bitterly disappointed by the continued neutrality, of the European powers. Unhappily the conscience of M. de Gasparin is not yet the conscience of England, or even of France.

At the middle of March, while we were yet resolutely closing our eyes to the prospect of war, our author could say: “Let us not deceive ourselves; the chances of civil war have been increasing for several weeks with frightful rapidity.” In case of war, he reckons the relative positions and advantages of North and South very differently from Mr. Spence, whose views we have given above, (and who had, moreover, the observation of six months of actual war to guide him,) but does not endeavor to predict the issue of so terrible a conflict. He is nevertheless convinced that, even should the Southern States succeed in establishing their independence, they will fail of the consolation of having ruined the United States, which must still keep their rank among the nations, with all the old traditions and all the actual power,—“of one

mind, masters of themselves, knowing their own needs, and putting to the service of a noble cause a constantly increasing power." But in the face of such a contrast in all the elements of national strength, the author does not believe in the permanent separation of the Union; and, besides, he believes that the reciprocal interest of the North and South in each other would of itself operate eventually to prevent such a conclusion. "In the United States, each portion stands in need of the other portion,—agricultural, manufacturing, commercial, they form together one of the most homogeneous countries that I know. I cannot believe that such a country is destined to be permanently divided, and that too in an age when the tendency is rather toward the union of small nations than toward the severance of great ones." (p. 253.)

A chapter follows on the coexistence of the white and black races after emancipation. Its views are intelligent and humane; but yet it seems to us that the most philosophic discussion of such a subject fails inevitably of any practical result, and that so many conditions will enter into the solution of that vast problem, which are at present utterly unforeseen, and must remain so until the question comes up for settlement, that we may as well pass the whole subject over at once into the list of problems whose only solution is empirical, and trust, with M. de Gasparin, that, if there shall ever be wisdom and courage enough to meet and master the question of *emancipation* itself, there will also be enough to solve the supplementary question of the coexistence of the races in freedom.

The book closes with a noble chapter on the regenerating influence which the present crisis must needs work on our political institutions and national character. The nation has come under another influence. That of the South was evil, and in the long period of its continuance had compromised everything. That of the North now begins, which is to elevate and save both institutions and character. Gasparin confesses he has no partiality for the republican form of government,—he prefers the English constitution; but he is careful not to put form above substance. Moreover, he thinks he sees, with De Tocqueville, that France, spite of her present absolutism, tends toward democracy; and he says that, in

view of such a possibility, it becomes intelligent Frenchmen to examine and understand the working of democratic institutions in America, and not to encourage a contempt for Americans because of them. The coarser results of democracy — its rudeness, its violence, its levelling propensities, and the like — are on the surface, and must gradually disappear. The loss of individuality in the mass, the absorption of private conscience by the state, the tyranny of the majority, — these are graver evils, and the probability of safely avoiding them has increased immensely with the movement by which the nation has cast off its old subserviency to the Southern power. This chapter is worthy of De Tocqueville, and is nearly or quite free from the enthusiasm of the earlier portions.

With two more extracts we must take our leave of this most interesting book. The first is a serious warning to England against forsaking her ancient ground as the champion and advocate of Freedom against Slavery : —

“ Let England take heed ! She had better lose Malta, Corfu, and Gibraltar than abandon the glorious position which her long struggle against slavery and the slave-trade has gained for her in the esteem of the nations. Even in this, the day of iron-clad frigates and of rifled cannon, the first of forces is yet, thank God, the moral force. Woe to that nation which consents to let go that force, and to sacrifice its principles to its interests. From the beginning, the enemies of England, and they are many, have prophesied that the cause of Cotton would be heavier in her balance than the cause of Justice and Liberty. The world prepares to judge her by her conduct in the American crisis. Once more, let her take heed ! ” — p. 392.

The other extract is one in which we are assured of the sympathy and good-will of France : —

“ It is from a distance that we express our sympathy, but it concerns events of which one judges better perhaps from a distance than close at hand. Europe is well placed for appreciating the actual crisis. The opinion of France in particular should have some weight in the United States. Independently of our old alliance, we are perhaps the nation most interested in the success of the Union. There are friendly voices which here and there in our reviews and journals carry to it the cordial expression of our good wishes. In wishing the final triumph of the North, we are hoping for the welfare of North and South, — for their common grandeur and lasting prosperity. ” — p. 408.

If we are right in accepting such books as those of Mr. Spence and M. de Gasparin as in some degree representative of the feeling and mode of thought adopted, whether consciously or unconsciously, in their respective countries, we have only another instance (more pronounced and decided than those which have preceded it, in proportion to the unequalled magnitude of the occasion) of the singular variance which has always existed between the French and English views in regard to the United States. We are not speaking now of friendliness and aversion, of cordiality and coldness, of interest and indifference,—though just now, unfortunately, we do not lack for evidence that our late growing cordiality with Great Britain has been more sentimental than solid. But those Englishmen who have visited this country with the view of book-making (and their name is legion) have in general passed by all consideration of institutions with a hopeless chapter or two, to seize upon the trivial peculiarities of speech, of dress, of personal and daily habit; and have been contented if, on reaching home, they could send to the press their descriptions, brilliant or stupid as the case might be, of these crudities, and their prediction of certain and deserved ruin to the institutions which could produce them. Here let us say that we trust and believe that we have no undue sensitiveness in regard to the comments and criticisms of foreign writers on these topics. Toward Mrs. Trollope, Captain Hall, Mr. Dickens, Mr. Colley Grattan, and the rest of the numerous company of more or less intelligent critics, we have never felt the least tinge of that bitterness which was so generally excited by their books. We are perfectly assured that even the strictures of Mrs. Trollope did us unmixed good as a people, and had a much greater effect than was ever conceded to them in mitigating certain of the more startling peculiarities of that portion of the people of America which was most outraged by their publication. And we should be sorry to deny, what it is nevertheless painful to confess, that the "American Notes" of Mr. Dickens, though filled with the most laughable, and doubtless intentional exaggerations, and in the main with no more pretension to the character of an authentic narrative than the "Pickwick Papers," did nevertheless contain some perfectly se-

rious criticism on the tone of society and the conduct of affairs, in some most important particulars, which no true American could ever read without acknowledging with shame and sorrow their disgraceful truth. Such was that chapter toward the close of the book, on the character of the newspaper press of the United States,—a chapter which, we regret to say, is very nearly as true to-day as it was twenty years ago. We believe that the criticism of strangers, if intelligent and honest, is wholly beneficial, and more so than the same criticism from native writers. And yet is it impossible not to see that even the most friendly of English observers, though keen enough in detecting the trivialities of which we have spoken, have been utterly blind to the stronger peculiarities of constitution and laws, and to the principles which make their foundation; while so prolonged and constant a residence at the centre of affairs as that of the “Times Correspondent,” an unusually practised and intelligent observer, seems to have qualified him only for the most complete misapprehension of the present, and the most stupid prophecies of the future. Such a uniform failure in apprehending the worth and the effects of our institutions cannot without absurdity be attributed to incompetency in a nation which has produced such writers as Bentham and Adam Smith in the past, and as Buckle and Mill in the present,—the rather as those institutions rest on the same ground of constitutional liberty and representation with their own;—and, debarred from so easy a conclusion, we cannot be far wrong in believing that it may be due, partly at least, to a certain jealousy (stoutly denied, but not the less probable) at the unexampled growth in wealth and consideration which has resulted from those institutions, and to an uneasy consciousness that much in their own forms might profit by a revision and comparison which the pride of Englishmen will not yet allow them to undertake. Thus the very likeness and relation between the two nations has operated as a bar to intimate sympathy, and to candid and intelligent criticism.

But with France the case has been widely different. From the days of Lafayette down through those of De Tocqueville to the present, the French mind, always more subtile and philosophic than the English, has seemed to delight in recognizing

with a certain surprise and curiosity the peculiarities of the young republic which began, continued, and is likely to end, in utter repudiation of every maxim of French policy, and every canon of French taste. There has never been much French travel in the United States, nor any intimate literary relations between the two countries;—our boisterous politics must have disgusted Frenchmen at least as much as Englishmen, whose own are not quite free from noise and tumult;—our offences against good taste in the conduct of domestic affairs cannot have been less conspicuous to the most polite people in Europe, than to that which is perhaps the least polite;—and yet we find such men as De Tocqueville, Brissot de Warville, Michel Chevalier, Laboulaye, and De Gasparin inquiring with the liveliest interest into the working of our political system, and into the public and private manners of our people, and discussing, not always favorably we admit, but rarely with serious misapprehension, and never with bitterness, questions which the English writers have passed by in contemptuous silence, or have made the subjects for sneers and abuse. Remembering these facts, we shall not be surprised that the same contrast which established itself in the days of the Revolution, and has existed more or less visibly ever since, reappears to-day, in stronger colors than ever, in the dignity and patience with which the French nation has awaited the event of the present struggle, and the bitter and sordid selfishness which the British have exhibited under the same trial.

From the strange and stern experiences of the time, this government and people will have learned, among other lessons of greater or less importance, two which they will not be likely soon to forget;—first, that no people, however perfect in theory its institutions, or however favorable may seem the conditions under which its political and social life moves on, is ever so safe from internal disturbance and revolt as to be justified in neglecting the means of enforcing, on the largest scale, its legitimate authority; and secondly, that, when such disturbance comes, the nation affected can never look for any honest expression of sympathy or support from foreign governments beyond what is prompted by their clearest interests. In our long period of unbroken prosperity, we had so perseveringly

put far from us all recognition of the possibility of such a thing as actual rebellion under a popular government administered like our own, as to have quite lost sight of the great and lamentable fact that material interest is still in every community a stronger motive for political action than any regard for plighted faith, or for the rights of majorities,—a fact quite sufficient to account both for the rebellion at home, and for the support it receives abroad. It was because we had lost sight of this great fact, that, during those dreary months when the South was getting ready for the conflict, the people of the loyal States looked on at those ominous preparations more in wonder and incredulity than in apprehension,—and at the wickedness of the conniving government at Washington with the charity of a community utterly blind to its most obvious results. It was because we had lost sight of this great fact, that, after the struggle had fairly begun, after the breathless and agonizing apprehension with which the people followed the rush of the three-months' men to the capital,—when its safety was at length assured, and the nation with a sigh of relief put by its first hot enthusiasm and settled to its work, of which even then it failed to realize the gigantic proportions,—we then looked across the water for the expected words of good cheer from “the mother country,” and were smitten with a keen disappointment when, after a most unpromising silence, we found, first, the proclamation of neutrality, next, an ill-concealed popular sympathy with the South, and then misrepresentation of the character and aims of the North, developing rapidly into open and avowed advocacy of the rebel cause, coupled with the most malignant and brutal abuse of the government and the people of the loyal States. If on the Continent, where governments and people are seldom on so good terms with each other as in England, we saw now and then some evidence of a popular sympathy with the national cause, we were not long in discovering that the courts and ministers of Europe were not likely to look with much disfavor on the expected humiliation of a rival power whose traditions were those of popular liberty; and, with the exception of the cordial note of the Russian Minister, every incident of diplomatic intercourse since then has confirmed that impression.

The disappointment was bitter, but wholesome. We have cared too anxiously for the opinion of foreign nations, and have often claimed their admiration on grounds wholly unworthy the enthusiasm or the pride of a great people. If now where we looked for friendship we find only indifference, and where we looked for neutrality we find secret or avowed antagonism, it may save us from the complications which might well arise from foreign alliances, and keep our eyes and thoughts turned steadfastly to the great work and its clear and unmistakable issue. Then we shall prove to foreign nations, what we began by telling them, that our motive is not ambition, nor love of power, but a deep sense of responsibility to the cause of the people and of self-government throughout the world. When this shall have been proved by great deeds and generous sacrifices, and the sublime work of restoration and of pacification shall have been accomplished,—then, as the nation moves forward once more in the majesty of a new life, it will be with no regret, but rather with a proud satisfaction, that we shall look back, and remember that we have fought our way through the darkness alone, and have come forth into the light, invincible, and ready to meet friendship or enmity with equal serenity.

---

ART. VIII.—1. *The Constitution of the United States of America, with an Alphabetical Analysis; the Declaration of Independence; the Articles of Confederation; the prominent Political Acts of George Washington, &c., &c., &c.* By W. HICKEY. Seventh Edition. Philadelphia. 1854.

2. *The Federalist, on the New Constitution, written in the Year 1788.* By MR. HAMILTON, MR. MADISON, and MR. JAY. With an Appendix, &c., &c. A new Edition. Hallowell: Glazier, Masters, and Smith. 1842.

3. *Constitutional Law. Being a Collection of Points arising upon the Constitution and Jurisprudence of the United States, which have been settled by Judicial Decisions and Practice.* By THOMAS SERGEANT, Esquire. Philadelphia: Abraham Small. 1822.